

## New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation, 100 Nassau Street, New York City. Rogers, Vice-President, Richard H. W. Rogers, Secretary, 100 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone, 154 Nassau Street, New York City. Telegrams, 154 Nassau Street, New York City.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$10.00; 6 months \$5.50; 3 months \$3.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 6 months \$5.50; 3 months \$3.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 3 months \$3.00; 1 month \$1.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 month \$1.00; 1 week \$0.25.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 week \$0.25; 1 day \$0.05.

**FOREIGN RATES**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$15.00; 6 months \$8.00; 3 months \$4.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 6 months \$8.00; 3 months \$4.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 3 months \$4.50; 1 month \$1.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 month \$1.50; 1 week \$0.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 week \$0.50; 1 day \$0.10.

**CANADIAN RATES**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$12.00; 6 months \$6.50; 3 months \$3.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 6 months \$6.50; 3 months \$3.50.  
Daily and Sunday, 3 months \$3.50; 1 month \$1.20.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 month \$1.20; 1 week \$0.30.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 week \$0.30; 1 day \$0.08.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## Can It Pay?

Germany is playing a desperate game in undertaking to starve out Great Britain by destroying all merchantmen carrying supplies to British ports. She is willing to declare war on all the neutral maritime nations on the mere chance of beating her chief enemy into submission.

Apart from the criminality of drawing the sword on neutral nations against which she has no grievance under international law, can such a gambler's policy pay? What hope has Germany of extinguishing the merchant marines on which Great Britain and her allies are depending for supplies?

It must be remembered that Germany's promises to the United States, made after the Sussex incident, have really affected passenger steamers only. The German submarines have continued their warfare on the freight carriers of the Entente powers and on neutral freight carriers other than those flying the American flag. Norway has lost a larger percentage of her merchant marine since the beginning of the war than either Great Britain or France has. Holland and Sweden have lost nearly as large a percentage of their shipping as Italy has. Moreover, the losses of France, Great Britain and Italy have been made up in part through the seizure of interned German shipping.

Recent calculations of sea losses show that Great Britain's has been about 11 per cent of the marine in existence before the war. But the ships built in 1915 and 1916 have offset most of this shrinkage. France has lost 12 per cent of her shipping, but made up half that through new construction. Italy has lost 9 per cent. Portugal's marine is larger to-day than it was before the war.

If it took Germany two years and a half to destroy this relatively small proportion of the merchant fleets of the Entente nations and of the three chief neutral carriers, how can even the improved submarines fleet expect to accomplish anything like an annihilation of neutral and belligerent carrying trade within the next six months? And six months is the period now set by the Germans for the realization of their last frantic hope of victory.

From a military point of view submarine warfare has been of little profit to Germany. It has hardly repaid the money and energy spent on it. It has had no results, and can have none, which would justify its continuation on a lawless and murderous scale, at the cost of war with the United States and other neutrals.

Yet such is the Tirpitz obsession, which has also filled the German public mind, that the German Government is willing, as Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg frankly says, to stake everything on the possibility of winning a victory through illegal and ferocious submarine warfare.

Under the spell of this frenzied illusion Germany is willing to renounce humanity and cast aside all respect for the restraints of law and civilization.

The new submarine campaign may yield many new victims. It may slake somewhat German thirst for revenge on the British. But it cannot pay. Germany can find no recompense in its horrors for being adjudged an outcast from civilization—an Ishmael and a pariah among the nations of the world.

## Costly Foolishness

The chief objection to the two-plateau system in the Fire Department, a test of which the Board of Aldermen has ordered, is that it would completely break down the efficiency of that organization as a fire-fighting agency. Probably the next greatest objection to it is on the score of cost. That the aldermen are already discovering. They have made provision for a bond issue of \$125,000 to cover the expenses. Fire Commissioner Adamson has warned them that the two-plateau arrangement cannot be put into effect with the present membership of the department. To have two brigades in the department, working fixed hours, would leave the city more or less unprotected. Consequently, if the scheme is to be tried with any degree of thoroughness and the public cared for as well, additions must be made to the membership of the department.

It is always within the prerogative of public officials to be foolish if they desire to be, but the taxpayers of New York must regret that this particular brand of foolishness took possession of the aldermen. The two-plateau scheme was tried faithfully and thoroughly for nearly three months in 1904 and 1905 in the third battalion of the Fire Department. The results shown caused its rejection. Every Fire Commissioner, every head of the uniformed fire-fighting force has set his face against it, not from any desire to grind down or overwork the firemen—the fire chiefs come from the ranks, and the commissioners have all been the warm friends of their men—but because they know the plan is vicious and harmful to the best interests of the city. It would be expensive;

it would produce a thoroughly dangerous division of responsibility between the two platoons; it would put the individual fireman on the basis of a time-serving labor unionite, watching the clock for quitting time, instead of being the eager, zealous, brave guardian of the public which men in that service must be if they are the right kind of men to stay there. The plan is so manifestly weak and dangerous—dangerous alike to the Fire Department and the public welfare—that there is little chance that this experiment will result in any permanent change in the methods of fighting and preventing fires which now rank this city's department as the best in the world. On that account the waste of city money in making the experiment is the more to be regretted.

## Not Even Partners?

Experimenting with that irritating yet entertaining puzzle matrimony, in the hope of lengthening and lightening its shackles, a modernist couple of our town, Margaret and Winthrop Lane, have taken a very long leap. Speaking in "The Evening Sun," Mrs. Lane explains that she and her husband have carried economic independence to this farthest limit:

"We do not pool our financial interests. We do not throw our earnings in one large heap and then spend it together, for to our minds that destroys the individuality that must somehow be preserved if the marriage is to be a success. We divide the bills evenly, and then each of us has the remainder of his or her own money for personal expenditures. Each of us remains a free person. If I make a mistake I will pay for that mistake myself. And my husband has the same happy feeling."

This might be a happy feeling. And again, we suspect, it might not. When a business partnership is formed, let us say between lawyers, one of the chief benefits sought and obtained is just this pooling of profits and losses, successes and mistakes. The theory of every such partnership is that in the long run such credit and debit items balance each other and there is no ultimate loss to either side, but a steady dividend of mutual helpfulness. The basic idea of partnership is precisely this aiding each other through tight places and past occasional mistakes.

So the thought occurs: If the law firm of Smith, Jones & Davis (with young Brown, Jones and Peppercorn as juniors, names on the door) can run a partnership with quite complete freedom of individuality, year in and year out, upon the basis of pooling profits and losses, why cannot a simple combination like Margaret and Winthrop Lane? Does the mere fact that you are married make a business partnership with your husband or wife impossible—or at least incompatible with true independence of soul? Perhaps some of our philosophical experimenters will explain.

## Cue to Genius

Dr. Arthur C. Jacobson makes a useful suggestion in "The New York Medical Journal" to those earnest and painstaking persons who spend their days in what they are pleased to call psychic research. He holds that the tomfooleries of the most celebrated mediums are at best trivial and insignificant in comparison with the feats of men of genius; and as he conceives that both groups of phenomena have a common origin in so far as each is the expression of a secondary personality, so it seems to him that an inquiry into the nature of genius would be more interesting and more fruitful than the tedious collection of mediumistic vapors. "Why delve so exhaustively into the lesser sphere," he asks, "and fool with Calibans, when the Prosperos, waving their magic wands, stand before us?"

The enthusiasts of automatic writing and planchette will quarrel with him at the outset for jumping to a conclusion. "There is, of course," he says, "nothing supernatural about mediumship. The medium is merely controlled . . . by a secondary personality that has come out of his (usually her) own subconscious mind." The "of course" will be objected to by spiritualists folk as too magisterial, just as others will doubtless object to the offhand "of course" of a naive enthusiast who in commenting upon Dr. Jacobson's conception of genius remarks that "of course it gains plausibility from the fact that it is solidly based on Freudian psychology."

It is the fashion at present to trace everything to Freud by way of establishing its respectability, but in truth there is nothing inevitably Freudian in Dr. Jacobson's discourse, except possibly the trick of putting forth unproved conclusions with only a bare "of course" to establish their authenticity. And as Dr. Jacobson is only offering a suggestion for a systematic inquiry, that is perhaps allowable.

If the dabblers in the spirit world resent this unceremonious way of dismissing their pet hypothesis there are others who will join with them in denouncing his teachings for other reasons. As his notion is that "the genius is a superman—a man plus a secondary personality, his genius residing not in the primary self, but in this secondary personality," so he fancies that a useful field of inquiry would be found in the inhibitions of potential genius. "The real miracle that invites our contemplation is the paralysis of inhibitory mechanisms." And then, drawing examples "from the clinic of life," he proceeds to give a long list of great men supposed to have overcome the paralyzing inhibitions by the use of alcoholic beverages.

His conclusion is that "the release of creative secondary personalities would seem to depend largely upon some sort of intoxication," and this he believes to be "obviously true" not only of alcohol but of tuberculosis, the toxins of which are also credited with the liberation of a multitude of ingenious personalities.

The truth is so far from obvious to all men that Huxley, for instance, held that one who required alcoholic provocation to produce work might take it as a sure sign that it was work for which he was unfitted. It may well be that he was wholly wrong; it may be, too, that Dr. Jacobson is wholly right in his assumption that his long list

of phthisical producers would have been uncreative but for the useful influence of tuberculosis. Still, it is for the present only an assumption and it cannot be proved by saying it is obvious and of course true.

But it is obvious that the only way to settle the matter is by a careful inquiry, and that is what Dr. Jacobson is driving at, of course.

## City Children and Imagination

It is a wise child that knows the uses of his own imagination—in a metropolis. Therefore we note with all the greater pleasure that a certain discerning Parents' Association of the West Side, made up, one would fancy, of men and women not always tied to the treadmill of a city existence, has determined that its children shall have a gigantic community backyard as its playground. Most hopeful of all is the proviso that it is not to be checkered with slides and swings and bars and sandboxes, but that it is to be outfitted with just the youngsters and the scope for their games.

No parent could make a city child a more precious gift than this one of space and the necessity for being sufficient unto himself. It is a necessity seldom brought home to the embryo Manhattanite. His pleasures, like his studies, are thoroughly systematized as a rule, and hopelessly efficient. His sports are tabloid and predestined. Joy mongers leave his guaranteed games at the door of mornings along with the certified milk. There is far too much apparatus about his life.

The great danger of metropolitan childhood is that the imagination, also, is compressed. It is difficult for the boys and girls to believe in Jack and the Beanstalk—they who have seen beans measured by the pound, and in no other way. And how shall they picture Aladdin and his magic lamp who have never crept into a cave and who know all lights as electric incandescents?

The average city playground would far better be stripped of half or all its apparatus. Then our children might be led to exercise their flabby initiative and to find room for some of those old, sturdy outdoor games that make up our own most shining memories of childhood.

Backyards are dear to all of us. They were the stages for our most joyous triumphs, as knights in jousts, and ladies swishing the borrowed gear of our first long skirts. We stocked huge cattle ranches there with pedigreed pebbles, and played bank with a green store of gooseberry currency. And sometimes, through the nodding hollyhock heads, the fairies peeped out at us as we played.

Some of these delights are necessarily denied to the little children of the metropolis, but most of them are quite possible, if only we will not hedge them about too closely with possessions and ready-made ideas. Now and then you will see the dreams of one who is an intimate of the nymphs in the eyes of a little East Side girl, dancing to a hurdy-gurdy. But the toy automobile dealt a cruel blow to fancy when it supplanted the broomstick as a steed, and the doll that says "Mamma" of itself is a fact unfriendly to imagination because it says no more. The rag doll was a real conversationalist.

This backyard park of the Parents' Association of the Horace Mann School is certainly a step in the right direction. It is to be no more than two vacant lots metamorphosed into a playground, where old-fashioned games are to be played and the "Keep off the grass" curse of childhood is to be unknown.

There are other vacant lots here and there over the city; sometimes a bough or two of a tree peeping over a billboard takes the imagination captive, as we hurry past them. The Parents' Association of the Horace Mann School was able to rent its lots for a comparative song from real estate dealers interested in the experiment.

Other dealers, also, might be cajoled into interest or prefer a small rental to having their lots lie idle. Why not an extension of the backyard propaganda for as many as possible of the city's youngsters? Why not a campaign for safeguarding our children's imagination, as we safeguard their morals?

## Bird Protection

(From The Chicago Herald.)  
Friends of wild birds and animals were sufficiently influential to persuade the governments of the United States and of Great Britain to ratify a migratory bird treaty on December 6 last. The effect of this treaty is the establishment of an embargo on non-game birds.

By its terms both Canada and this country are pledged to put a stop to the wanton killing of wild creatures. Everybody in a general way favors such a treaty. The utility to agriculture of many birds which were once slaughtered in wholesale fashion is now well known. In addition to that an appreciation of the interest and of the charm of these denizens of the fields and woods has become common. Public opinion sanctions the protection which is proposed.

But it can never be effective in this country without the creation of special officials. Despite the majority approval the treaty will not enforce itself. Consequently the National Association of Audubon Societies has drafted a bill which, among other things, directs the Department of Agriculture to look after the observance of the treaty. This measure is one of the minor expressions of the modern conscience, but it is none the less deserving of the serious attention of Congress.

## Civis Romanus Sum

A citizen of Rome, strong, proud and free. Rome guards me. Well the outer nations know Rome's might, who dared to beard her as a foe.

Her galleys by their hundreds beg to sea; Who halts their course halts Rome; and let them see.

Their cause is just, for where the eagles go Until the trumpets of their victory blow. Rome knows no rest, while the odds may be.

But who are these proud citizens who creep About the world at some strange Kaiser's will? Whose ships go trembling forward on the deep.

Decked like a circus clown, What men fulfill Their duties so ignobly? Who can keep Their people honored whom they guard so ill?

A. C. GRETTON.

## DUTCH WORDS SURVIVE

Many Derivatives and Names from That Language Still in Use

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The editorial of the 25th inst. entitled "Scups and Others" moves me to add to the number of words of Dutch origin which have been retained in local speech. The impress of the first settlers here has survived in this particular much more than is generally recognized.

There is the delectable cake known as the "cruller," which is much different from the doughnut, a degenerate product of Yankee-land. A pessimist has been described as one who only sees the hole in the latter. No one, pessimist or other, could find one in the cruller, which has the distinction of having had the dough twisted prior to the process of cooking. When next you call for coffee and crullers note this fact. The Dutch verb, "krullen," to curl or turn, supplies the reason for the name.

All of us use the word "kill" more or less, for many geographical localities hereabouts are so designated. Such places as Kill van Kull, Dutch Kills, Peekskill and Catskill, in this state, and Schuylkill, in Pennsylvania, are familiar. The longest stream which indented the west shore of the island, the Great Kill, had one source at Broadway and Thirty-ninth Street, and this was undoubtedly the reason of the accident there a short time ago during the excavation for the subway, an explanation which was given in the newspaper accounts.

Another branch started near Seventh Avenue and Fifty-seventh Street, and both joined before the creek emptied into the Hudson at Forty-fourth Street. From it arose the appellation of the Great Kill Road, ran east to beyond Eighth Avenue, and thence continued through Chelsea to its termination in the block between Forty-first and Forty-second Streets, Eighth and Ninth Avenues, where it met at right angles the Road Round the Tour, thereby leading the traveller to the Great Kill.

That essentially New York term, "stoop," in the phrase, "high stoop house," for example, is just an adaptation of the word "stoep," meaning "the steps at the entrance of a house." The local name "Gramercy" is derived from "krom," crooked, and "mesje," little knife, a designation suggested by the bend in the creek which ran through the present park. Scholars generally have agreed to this derivation. The name of the children's friend, Santa Claus, comes from "Klaas," i. e., Nicholas, St. Nicholas being the patron saint of Holland and this city.

Pearl, Beaver and Bridge streets, and Maiden Lane and the Bowery still retain the original names, and the word Broadway is a literal translation of "de Breede Weg," by which name the thoroughfare was called by the Dutch. Doubtless your readers could supply other examples, and so add to the interest in this subject while it is uppermost.

HOPPER STRIKER MOTT.

New York, Jan. 31, 1917.

## Such Naivete!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial on "Citizenship for Teachers" deserves the full endorsement of all fair-minded Americans. No applause is needed for the action of the Board of Superintendents; the wonder rather is that our public schools have for so long harbored teachers who not only lack legal citizenship, but are often devoid of the spirit of Americanism.

About two years ago I took the examination as teacher of foreign languages in the city's day high schools, was the only successful candidate and, as far as I know, am still the only one who holds a license to teach that particular subject. When the time came for filing testimonials and other evidence of fitness I was simple enough to put in the very first my citizenship paper, only to learn that such paper was unnecessary. I was under the naive impression that this city would not pay educators before assuring itself that it was paying an American and not Siberian or Ethiopian educator.

The fact of the whole matter is that the city is paying salaries to non-citizen teachers, while I, a citizen, have not even been able to secure a place in the evening high schools.

New York, Jan. 31, 1917.

## Preparedness

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If the wisdom of the "despised and rejected" ancients were not so lightly dismissed as it is to-day it might be less difficult to persuade some of our "leaders of thought" of the right meaning of national preparedness. The Romans of the age of Augustus must have keenly appreciated the blessing of peace and anxiously sought to preserve it. What, however, is their creed in this matter? In the pages of Horace (Satires, 2, 2, 110-111) we come upon this thought, proverbial with the Romans, which means in simplest form: Si vis pacem, para bellum. (Translated for readers with a "modern" education, it signifies: If you wish peace, prepare for war.)

Is this only a mad precept, characteristic of a nation of militarists, who were incapable of a higher ideal and vision, or is it the belief of a practical people, accustomed to deal with the facts of reality, a people whose law and government were an instinctive contribution to the progress of civilization?

A READER.

Valatie, N. Y., Jan. 31, 1917.

## A New Empire State

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read with a good deal of interest the letter from J. H. Bellinger in this morning's issue, and while to a certain extent his article is true, I believe it would only be a question of time when some political party would be so firmly rooted that no one could have it displaced. For some time I have been working on what I believe would be an ideal state. I call it the Empire State. Take a geography and draw an imaginary line from Port Jervis to the boundary line between Connecticut and Vermont. This would bring into this new state some of the wealthiest counties in this state. Then, with the concurrence of the citizens, include the following counties in New Jersey: Bergen, part of Passaic, Essex and Hudson counties. Let the westerly boundaries be the Pamunkey and Rockaway rivers. As at present a great majority of the citizens in these counties have business in this city. This new Empire State would become one of the wealthiest, and what is more to be considered, the greatest business state in the world, barring none.

H. HENRY D. KLINKER.  
New York, Feb. 2, 1917.

## A Forty-ninth State

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A most comprehensive aspect of the subject of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, embracing a tract bounded by a line drawn from Thorn to near Cracow on the west to the rivers Bug and Niemen on the east, was made a constitutional kingdom, subject to the Czar, but in 1832 was declared a Russian province. In 1863 this Kingdom of Poland disappeared, and was subsequently known as the "Territory of the Vistula," and later as the "Vistula Government." It is this portion of the original Kingdom of Poland which was in the President's mind when he

freight ships, Great Britain by her illegal and brutal acts has made it necessary for us to sink armed ships at sea, horrible as the thought is to the paternal Prussian heart overflowing with the milk of prussic acid.

CLARENCE LUCAS.  
New York, Feb. 1, 1917.

## A Protest Sufficient

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the interest of fairness:

## GERMAN RUTHLESSNESS

More Views of Tribune Readers Upon America's Course—One Opinion Holds That Protest Is Enough, as in the Case of the Allies' Blockade—A Precedent from the Past and a Call for Sanity

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On May 15, 1915, the day on which President Wilson's first note on the Lusitania tragedy was published, the writer addressed a brief letter of two lines to a prominent newspaper of this city, saying: "President Wilson's note will accomplish nothing. Brute force is the only argument which Germany uses or accepts. Results will show."

That prediction has come true to the letter. Results have shown that the Lusitania tragedy is still unavenged and unatoned for. The writer will venture to hazard one more statement, viz: Should any acute complications arise between this country and Germany, predicated upon Germany's recent note threatening a renewal of submarine atrocities, the President of the United States will, in practical effect, make a total, complete and absolute backdown from the stand which he took in what is known as his Sussex note.

He will eat his own words, and there will be no break with Germany.

New York, Feb. 1, 1917.

## A Revised Version

To the Editor of The Tribune.

S. I. I subscribe herewith my revised version of Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg's recent speech in the Reichstag. I have expressed the Chancellor's thought rather than his words.

"Whereas the Prussian blockade of Paris in 1870 was successful and the Prussian blockade of England in 1914-17 is thus far a failure, the world is ordered to judge that the present British blockade of Germany is entirely illegal. You are commanded, therefore, gentlemen, to pull the Berlin wool over the eyes of the world so that the Prussian blockade of Paris may be forgotten and that no one will observe that the brutal British blockade could be ended at once by our surrender, even as the French ended the blockade of Paris. (Carried unanimously.)"

"And whereas individual initiative is inimical to imperial interests and fosters the detested doctrine of the rights of countries where culture unfortunately takes the place of culture, you are sentenced to group thinking. Germans must think, act, speak and hate England as one man, including women, remembering always that France—beloved France, which we admire so intensely since Verdun—has not the cold, fish heart of England, and would not force us to live on straw and turnips in our 'fodderland.' (Carried unanimously, with the exception of one socialist, who is sentenced to five years' penal servitude.)"

"And whereas it is evident that even our enemies love and admire Goethe, Beethoven, Schiller, Schumann, Heine, Wagner and other Germans, who, alas, were not Prussians, and who lived before the sun of Prussianism had arisen to its meridian glory to dim the candlelight of duller days, be it enacted that henceforth the world transfer its hero worship to von Tirpitz and von Hindenburg, and that it tremble in terror before the might of the twin titans whom God, with the consent of the Kaiser, has appointed to crush the unprepared and commercial criminals who forced this unexpectedly long war on a nation as heavily armed as ourselves. (Carried as per order.)"

"And whereas the naval battle of Jutland was such a tremendously overwhelming victory for Germany that his imperial majesty (all rise together when von H.R. lifts his hand and exclaim, 'Hoch! Hoch!') twice, strictly in time with the waving hand—as I was saying, the Kaiser, with the instincts of a true sportsman, has allowed the shattered fleet of England eight months to rest up. But we mean to continue this careful crushing of proud Albion's navy until we have won German freedom of the seas and until our ships can sail unchallenged and flaunt our flag triumphantly on the Prussian blue. (Loud cheers, followed by the singing of 'Die Wacht am Rhein.')"

"And whereas the submarine, raised by Prussian prestige from its lowly rank as a mere American toy to the honor of being admitted to the German navy, has accomplished the hitherto impossible feat of sinking great passenger ships ten times its size, and has made an indelible record which no other nation will ever imitate, which record is set in letters of imperishable brass in the history of Prussianism and Germany, we now declare that though our undersea boats have mainly given their attention to the sinking of unarmed and unarmed passenger and freight ships, they are to be turned to the sinking of the great liners of the world."

## WHAT DOES UNITED POLAND MEAN?

The statement above quoted? If his statement be true, that "statesmen everywhere desire the existence of a 'united, independent and autonomous Poland,' whether as an empire, kingdom or republic, he should without delay advise the Senate, and through them the people of this country, of the names and nationality of some of these 'statesmen.'"

W. DOUGLASS.  
Ridgefield, N. J., Jan. 26, 1917.

## Who Sells the Cheap Food?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Now that the twenty-one-day test of the 25-cent food has been made and it has been found that a man can be suitably nourished for that sum, would it not be a good idea for the dietitian or business manager, or whoever did the purchasing for their meals, to tell the public where food can be purchased at the prices quoted? Unfortunately I lost the clippings I made from the papers which gave the actual cost of foods as served, but I do know that, excepting the bread, every article was from 5 to 100 per cent lower than it can be secured in any market I know of. Begin with milk quoted at 8 cents. All "B" milk is 10 cents, and "A" is 12 cents. Hamburger steak was quoted at 14 cents, I think. It is 24 cents a pound in a first class market. Bacon I pay 45 cents a pound for. It is a little less in the piece, but also somewhat. I remember, it was quoted at about 20 cents in the price list, and so on with all the meats. Bananas are from 20 to 30 cents a dozen, and oranges from 30 cents up. Yet they were quoted at 1 cent each.

Unless it can be told where food can be purchased at the prices which were quoted, I can't see how anything of value has been demonstrated.

MABEL WILSON KECK.  
Flushing, N. Y., Jan. 30, 1917.

## "What Did He Mean?"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For your editorial entitled "What Did He Mean?" in which you refute the absurd contentions of "The New York World" with regard to President Wilson's Senate speech, I thank you. In to-day's issue of that same paper is an editorial inveighing against the "stupidity" of the President's critics and pointing out that what he meant was not to impose peace terms upon the belligerents, but merely to state what kind of peace must be made if the United States is to be a party to its guarantee. "The World" hardly better the case by this explanation. The kind of peace we will guarantee, says Mr. Wilson, must be a "peace without victory"—in other words, it must be such a peace as will bring no adequate punishment to those nations which, even "The World" admits, are the aggressors and beginners of this awful conflict.

G. H. W.  
Boston, Mass., Jan. 26, 1917.

## GERMAN RUTHLESSNESS

More Views of Tribune Readers Upon America's Course—One Opinion Holds That Protest Is Enough, as in the Case of the Allies' Blockade—A Precedent from the Past and a Call for Sanity

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the interest of fairness:

In your issue of this morning, as a sub-head over the text of the German note, you say: "Submarine Pledge to the United States Repudiated." Near the conclusion of the note you print, in black faced type, that the Imperial Government "is now compelled to continue the fight for existence, again forced upon it, with the full employment of all weapons which it has at its disposal."

When Germany surrendered to the demands of this country and forwent the use against her enemies of her most effective weapon at sea it was distinctly stated in the note according to the wishes of the government of the United States, of course in diplomatic language, that Germany, while not admitting her course to have been unjustified theretofore, would thereafter order all submarine commanders to observe the rules of international law as to visit and search and would otherwise modify her methods of treatment of merchant vessels by submarines only upon condition that the United States required Great Britain and her allies in the future also to observe the rules of international law as they were understood before the commencement of the war.

At that time this tone of Germany's note was considered by you and by some other journals as insulting to the dignity of the United States. Some publications went so far as to contend that the note should be returned and diplomatic relations forthwith broken off.

Long prior to the sinking of the Sussex our State Department had protested to England upon the subject of her so-called blockade and had not hesitated to say that the same was illegal. The same attitude, although not quite so clearly expressed, has been taken by our State Department as to England's orders in council declaring a war zone and making other rules not justified by the practice of nations in their relations with each other, and it now appears that, seriously with the neutral rights of this country and of many other countries which are not parties to the war.

The Administration at Washington has not insisted upon any modification of England's unlawful methods.

In going back to the methods pursued prior to her promise to the United States Germany has simply done what she said she would do in case England were